

## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF OLDŘICH FRÍŠ

Compiled by *Hana Knížková*

## Abbreviations:

ArOr = Archiv Orientální  
NO = Nový OrientLN = Lidové noviny  
R = Book Review

## 1938

1. Sodoma Gomora. (Naše řeč 22, 1938, pp. 194—199.)

## 1939

2. O ustrnování rozšířených výrazů. (Listy filologické 66, 1939, pp. 170—205.)

## 1944

3. Z indické poesie. Matka země. (Akord 11, 1943—1944, pp. 169—171.)
4. Z prákrtské lyriky. Prší, Plameňák, K měsíci, Gazela, Světla noc, Jen dva. (Akord 11, 1943—1944, pp. 171—172.)
5. *Bhartrharih*, Odříkání. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (Akord 11, 1943—1944, p. 173.)
6. K ukázkám z indické poesie. (Akord 11, 1943—1944, pp. 192—194.)
7. Poesie staré Indie. Rek, V noci. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 5273, 1944, 14. 3., p. 1.)
8. Vzpomínka na rodný kraj. (LN 5289, 1944, 30. 3., p. 1.)
9. Poslední květ. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 52107, 1944, 18. 4., p. 1.)
10. Konec. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 52194, 1944, 16. 7., p. 5.)
11. Ze staroindické poesie. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 52290, 1944, 28. 10., p. 1.)
12. Ze staroindické poesie. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 52311, 1944, 22. 11., p. 1.)
13. Ze staroindické poesie. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 52314, 1944, 25. 11., p. 1.)
14. Ze staroindické poesie. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 52331, 1944, 15. 12., p. 1.)
15. Ze staroindické poesie. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (LN 52333, 1944, 17. 12., p. 1.)

## 1945

16. *Rudolf Janíček*, Bůh jsi ty. Bhagavadgíta. (R: NO 11, 1945—1946, p. 28.)

## 1946

17. Z prákrtské lyriky. (NO 22—3, 1946—1947, p. 32.)
18. Zas jednou doma. (Translation from Indian Poetry into Czech.) (Svobodné noviny 2242, 1946, 22. 10., p. 1.)
19. Jak jsi se bála... (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 24, 1946—1947, p. 10.)
20. Odborný rozbor dvou překladů Dhammapada. (R: NO 24; 1946—1947, pp. 26—27.)

## 1947

21. Sattasai. Sbírka sedmi set strof. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) Praha, Symposion, (typ. Cíl 1947). 69-[II] pp.
22. Notes on Hála's Sattasai. (ArOr 16, 1947—1948, pp. 89—91.)
23. Two words from Amaruśataka. (ArOr 16, 1947—1948, pp. 92—95.)

24. Česká díla prof. V. Lesného. (NO 2<sub>5</sub>, 1946—1947, pp. 3—4.)
25. Kořeny indické lyriky (NO 3, 1947—1948, pp. 2—3.)
26. Tu sladký loutny tón ... (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 2<sub>6</sub>—7, 1946—1947, p. 7.)
27. *Kálicásah*, Jaro. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 2<sub>6</sub>—7, 1946—1947, p. 40.)
28. Z védských hymnů. Matka země. (NO 2<sub>9</sub>—10, 1946—1947, pp. 24—26.)
29. Snědené koláče. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 3, 1947—1948, p. 18.)
30. *Bhartrharih*. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 3, 1947—1948, p. 23.)
31. Jednota všeho. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 3, 1947—1948, p. 44.)
32. *Sómadévah*, Démonovy povídky. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 3, 1947—1948, pp. 45—46.)

## 1948

33. Láska a odříkání. (Translation from Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali into Czech.) Praha, E. Beaufort, nár. spr. (1948). 52-[II] pp.
34. Védské hymny. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) Praha, Symposion (1938). 79-[II] pp.
35. České lodě připlouvají z Indie. (Výstava orientální knihy, Praha 1948, pp. 13—19.)
36. Jacísi žebraví mniši ... (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 3, 1947—1948, p. 131.)
37. Nad hrobem. Z Rgvédu. (NO 3, 1947—1948, p. 147.)
38. Z indické moudrosti. (NO 3, 1947—1948, pp. 199, 214, 215.)
39. *Budhasvámí*, Dobrodružství v Čampě. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 3, 1947—1948, pp. 212—215.)
40. *Kálicásah*, Léto. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 3, 1947—1948, p. 223.)
41. *Bilhanah*, Padesát strof o tajné lásce. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech, together with Fr. Hrubín.) (NO 4, 1948—1949, p. 45.)
42. *Sómadévah*, Věrní manželé. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) NO 4, 1948—1949, p. 62.)
43. Bidpajovy bajky v novém rouše. (R: NO 3, 1947—1948, p. 189.)
44. *Vincenc Lesný*, Buddhismus. (R: Naše věda 26, 1948—1949, pp. 73—75.)

## 1949

45. Soucitná smrt. Mahábháratam XII, 256. (Praha, Nový Orient 1949.) 28-[II] pp.
46. Zastírání a charakterisování rodu. (Časopis pro moderní filologii 32, 1949, pp. 67—69.)
47. Překlady ruských autorů do novindických jazyků. (NO 5, 1949—1950, p. 69.)
48. *Sómadévah*. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 4, 1948—1949, p. 133.)
49. Z prákrtské lyriky. Páv, Podzim. (NO 4, 1948—1949, p. 137.)
50. Potopa světa. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 5, 1949—1950, pp. 62—63.)
51. *Santha Rama Rau*, Domov do Indie. (Z angličtiny přel. Eug. a St. Felberovi.) (R: NO 4, 1948—1949, p. 116.)
52. *Mulk Rádž Ánand*, Velké srdce. (R: NO 4, 1948—1949, p. 167.)
53. Nad novou knihou Dhana Gópála Mukerdžího. (R: NO 5, 1949—1950, pp. 23—24.)
54. Československý film o Indii. (R: NO 5, 1949—1950, p. 69.)

## 1950

55. The IE. Comparative. (ArOr 18<sub>1</sub>—2, 1950, pp. 170—188.)
56. Indo-Iranica. (ArOr 18<sub>3</sub>, 1950, pp. 73—79.)
57. Slovníček k: S. A. Dange, Indie od prakomunismu k otroctví. (Praha, Svoboda 1950, pp. 169—190.)
58. *Thieme P.*, Untersuchungen zur Wortkunde und Auslegung des Rigveda. (R: ArOr 18<sub>1</sub>—2, 1950, p. 551.)
59. *Skurzak L.*, Études sur l'origine de l'ascetisme indien. (R: ArOr 18<sub>1</sub>, 1950, pp. 385—388.)
60. Cyklus přednášek indické sekce. (R: NO 5, 1949—1950, p. 114.)
61. Román o indickém kastovníctví. (R: NO 5, 1949—1950, pp. 112—113.)
62. Indie dnes. [By] R. P. Dutt. (R: NO 5, 1949—1950, pp. 231—232.)

## 1951

63. The Recensions of Amaruśataka. (ArOr 19, 1951, pp. 125—176.)
64. The Avestan Studies. (ArOr 19, 1951, pp. 492—513.)
65. Indický motiv u českého autora. (NO 6, 1951, p. 13.)
66. Hospodářský základ jednoho společenského zvyku. (NO 6, 1951, pp. 52—53.)
67. Indie po třech letech. (NO 6, 1951, pp. 57—58.)
68. O indickém materialismu. (NO 6, 1951, pp. 77—79.)
69. Myšlení v pětících. (NO 6, 1951, pp. 166—168.)
70. Klasické drama v Indii. (NO 6, 1951, pp. 196—200.)
71. Seiler H., Die primären griechischen Steigerungsformen. (R: ArOr 19, 1951, pp. 292—293.)
72. Articles on India. (Indijskij sbornik.) (R: ArOr 19, 1951, pp. 640—641.)
73. *Bhabanī Bhattācārja*, Hlad se valí do Indie. (R: NO 6, 1951, p. 22.)
74. Indický sborník. (R: NO 6, 1951, p. 112.)
75. R. Palme Dutt, Krise britského imperialismu. (R: NO 6, 1951, p. 177.)

## 1952

76. Ein mißverständener Vers des Avesta. (ArOr 20, 1952, pp. 598—600.)
77. Osvobozenecký boj v Orientě. (NO 7, 1952, p. 1.)
78. Sedmdesátiny prof. Lesného. (NO 7, 1952, pp. 69—71.)
79. O životě a díle Bilhanově. (NO 7, 1952, pp. 156—157.)
80. Česká orientalistika v roce 1952. (NO 7, 1952, pp. 158—159.)
81. *Bilhana*, Dnes ještě. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech, together with Fr. Hrubín.) (NO 7, 1952, p. 158.)
82. Mahabharata (Volume I. Adiparvan). Translated from Sanskrit into Russian by V. I. Kaljanov. (R: ArOr 20, 1952, pp. 334—336.)
83. Paul Thieme, Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte. (R: ArOr 20, 1952, pp. 659—661.)
84. J. Holub—F. Kopčický, Etymologický slovník jazyka českého. (R: ArOr 20, 1952, pp. 661—662.)

## 1953

85. Struktura staroindické společnosti. (Učební texty vysokých škol.) Praha, Státní pedagogické nakladatelství 1953. 93 pp.
86. *Bilhana*, Dnes ještě. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech, together with Fr. Hrubín.) Praha, Nový Orient 1953. [24 ll.].
87. † Vincenc Lesný. (ArOr 21, 1953, pp. 25—26.)
88. The IE. comparative suffix *-ios* and the neuter suffix *-os*. (ArOr 21, 1953, pp. 101—113.)
89. Etymologische Forschungen. (ArOr 21, 1953, pp. 175—181.)
90. Za akademikem V. Lesným. (Nová cesta 115—16, 1953, p. 4.)
91. Akademik V. Lesný (3. 4. 1882—9. 4. 1953). (Věstník ČSAV 62, 1953, pp. 103—108.)
92. Otrokářský řád ve staré Indii. (NO 8, 1953, pp. 56—58.)
93. Akademik V. Lesný. (NO 8, 1953, p. 73.)
94. O Kálidásovi. (NO 8, 1953, pp. 123—124.)
95. Z indického humoru. Ze sbírky o copatých mniších. (NO 8, 1953, p. 29.)
96. Nad mrtvým. Sattasai. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (NO 8, 1953, p. 125.)
97. Z indických anthologií. Indradatta, Anonym. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 8, 1953, p. 127.)
98. Ze Sattasai. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 8, 1953, pp. 145, 146.)

## 1954

99. Sanskrtská čítanka. I. Praha, Nakladatelství ČSAV 1954. 183-[I] pp.
100. *Kálidása*, Oblak poslem lásky. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) Praha, Státní nakladatelství krásné literatury, hudby a umění 1954. 64-[I] pp.
101. Z indických legend. [Praha], (typ. Jaroslav Picka) [1954]. 34-[II] pp. (ll.).
102. Die Stämme auf -an im Avesta (ArOr 22, 1954, pp. 38—62.)
103. Orientalisté v Cambridgi. (NO 9, 1954, p. 159.)
104. Orientální umění okouzliče pražské diváky. (Lidová demokracie 10256, 1954, 24. 10., p. 4.)



105. Orientalistika a světový mír. (Lidová demokracie 10281, 1954, 24. 11., p. 6.)
106. Ze starých indických přísloví. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 9, 1954, p. 66.)
107. Z buddhistické lyriky. (Translation from Pali into Czech.) (NO 9, 1954, p. 69.)
108. Indická Šeherezáda, Vypravování o zlaté snítce. (NO 9, 1954, pp. 86—87.)
109. Ze Sattasai. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (NO 9, 1954, p. 87.)
110. Dandin, Příhody v městě Čampě. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 9, 1954, pp. 118—121.)
111. Z indické lyriky. (Translation from Prakrit into Czech.) (NO 9, 1954, p. 132.)
112. Z indických sentencí. (NO 9, 1954, pp. 147, 158.)
113. Dobrý král. Z Brahmapurāṇy (recte Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa). (NO 9, 1954, pp. 116—117.)
114. Hauschild R., Handbuch des Sanskrit von A. Thumb, II<sup>2</sup>. (R: ArOr 22, 1954, pp. 136—138.)
115. Tavadia J. C., Indo-Iranian Studies. (R: ArOr 22, 1954, pp. 619—620.)
116. Mayrhofer M., Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen (R: ArOr 22, 1954, pp. 620—621.)
117. Chandrasekharan, Brahmasri K., Subrahmanya Sastri V. H., Sanskrit Literature. (R: ArOr 22, 1954, pp. 621—622.)
118. Parikh J. T., Sanskrit Comic Characters. The Vidūṣaka, Theory and Practice. (R: ArOr 22, 1954, p. 622.)

## 1955

119. Orientalism in Czechoslovakia. (ArOr 23, 1955, pp. 2—5).
120. Two Readings of the Kathopanishad. (ArOr 23, 1955, 6—9).
121. K dějinám indické matematiky. (NO 10, 1955, p. 25.)
122. Protrhla se hráz světa... (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 10, 1955, p. 5.)
123. Krátké štěstí. Z Brahmapurāṇy. (NO 10, 1955, pp. 12—13.)
124. Ze sanskrtských přísloví. (NO 10, 1955, pp. 35, 43.)
125. Ta noc... (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 10, 1955, p. 40.)
126. Z veršů Bhartrhariho. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.) (NO 10, 1955, p. 51.)
127. Walter Ruben, Einführung in die Indienkunde. (R: Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie. 3, 1955, pp. 397—401.)

## In preparation:

128. Sanskrtská čítanka II. (Slovník sanskrtsko-česko-anglicko-ruský.)
129. Kālidāsa, Rtusamhāra. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.)
130. Démonovy povídky [Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā]. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.)
131. Rāmājana. (Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.)
132. Kālidāsa, Nářek nad Indumatí [From Raghuvamśa]. [Translation from Sanskrit into Czech.]

The Author thanks Dr. Gampert for his help in the Compilation of this Bibliography.

## LYDIAN INTERPRETATIONS

By *Ladislav Zgusta*, Praha.

Foreword. I. The interpretations. 1. The words *viššis nivišcr*. 2. The word *ašinaš*. 3. The root *c-*. 4. The word *karoš* and the name *Karoš*. 5. The verb *ēnslībid*. 6. The words *tešaštīd*, *šrfāštīd*. 7. The word *citalad*. 8. The fragment ...*ftellis*. 9. The mason's mark *tiv*. 10. A remark to the syntaxis of the pronouns in the imprecation formulae. 11. An anaphorical pronoun? 12. The ending *-l < -ll*. 13. The ending *-l < -λ* or instead of it. 14. The absence of endings. II. Lydian and Hittite.

The far from numerous set of the Lydian inscriptions, which were found mostly in Sardis, has the advantage of having been edited in an excellent and exemplary manner. Enno Littmann (*Sardis*, Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis, VI, 1, Leyden 1916) and his successor, W. H. Buckler (*Sardis*, VI, 2, Leyden 1924) applied the best technique and the soundest judgement to their task. And as Buckler has re-edited also the inscriptions already edited by Littmann, not only the newly found ones, his edition contains a full set of 51 Lydian inscriptions in minuscules, majuscules and photographs. The two inscriptions identified subsequently are very short; they are included in the convenient edition of Johannes Friedrich, *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, hggbn. von H. Lietzmann, 163), Berlin 1932.

There is a considerable number of papers dealing with the Lydian. It would serve no purpose, however, to record here all of them. The most important are: Kahle's and Sommer's discussion of the great bilingual inscription.<sup>1)</sup> This paper is the best interpretation of the inscription from which we derive the knowledge of a great part of Lydian words.

Wilhelm Brandenstein has written a series of papers on the subject.<sup>2)</sup> In these papers, he uses the method of combination to penetrate into the meaning of the Lydian inscriptions; he then proceeds to grammatical analyses of the material thus gained.

These are the most important publications on the Lydian inscriptions. Of course that there is a great lot of other articles on the Lydian, even some by the authors mentioned, but they have not the same fundamental relevance as the papers quoted.

<sup>1)</sup> Paul Kahle und Ferdinand Sommer, Die lydisch-aramäische Bilingue *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1, 1930 (really published June 1927), 18—86.

<sup>2)</sup> Die lydische Sprache I, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 36, 1929, 263—304; Die lydische Sprache II, *WZKM* 38, 1932, 1—67; Die Nominalformen des Lydischen, *Caucasica* 9, 1931, 25—40; Die lydische Nominalflexion, *Caucasica* 10, 1932, 67—94.

The reading of the Lydian alphabet may be considered as comparatively sure, although it goes without saying that the accurate phonetic character of the sounds represented by *c*, *v*, *ē* etc. escapes us.

The purpose of the present paper is to undertake some interpretations of the Lydian inscriptions and their language. In this, only the method of combination is used because we think it to be the only adequate instrument for such a task; therefore, no etymologies are proposed or discussed.

Some remarks upon the affinity of Lydian and Hittite then follow.

It hardly requires long argumentation to show that studies of this sort are very difficult and cannot have such absolutely sure results as if there is a better material at hand.

The method of combination is a distinct improvement when compared with the more wild etymologies which try to find the signification of a word. But even this method has certain limits of its possibilities. The number of the Lydian inscriptions is very small; it follows that a great part of the Lydian words are ἀπαξ εἰρημένα. And those which are not, are found twice or three times, or in formulae which are identic. The result of this state of affairs is that we can recognize only a very approximative signification of the words, and this only when we luckily are able to catch the general tenor of the passage in question. (Only the bilingual inscriptions give the relatively accurate meaning of a small number of words; but even this help is not very great because the Aramean text of the only longer bilingual inscription is not absolutely clear either.)

Another disadvantage of this situation is the necessity to undertake formal analyses of passages and words sometimes without knowing their meaning; this procedure is absolutely indispensable, but it is fraught with danger. E. g. we are compelled to assume that formal similarity implies a similarity of meaning. This is the case with the greatest majority of words in all the languages; the matter is so obvious that it is not necessary to produce examples. But there are always some instances of homonymy. Brandenstein was right in saying that such words as Lat. *canis* "dog" and *canis* "sing" 2<sup>nd</sup> sing. must shake our absolute confidence in the procedure just described; but he was equally right in remarking that we cannot do anything else but undertake the risk because there is no other way to penetrate into the structure of the language. And then, we know and are relieved to know that such mischievous identities of words are always, in any case exceptional.

The result of these considerations is that we have to apply the greatest possible caution and moderation to all our attempts to interpret the Lydian inscriptions. It is much better to get some smaller facts definitely established and thus to gain some certain ground for further studies than to try one's hand in far-reaching theories and hypotheses which can be used only as material for criticism, not as a base, if only a working base, for further research.



## I. THE INTERPRETATIONS.

1. The words *viššis nivišcv*.

In several inscriptions, we read the words *viššis nivišcv*:

7/5: *fakav viššis nivišcv varbtokid* || <sup>2a)</sup>

6/5: *fakav viššis nivišcv varbtokid* ||

8/11: *fakav viššis nivišcv varbtokid* ||

10/23: *akav viššis nivišcv varbtok* ||

The best interpretation given up to now was suggested by Brandenstein,<sup>3)</sup> who translates *viššis* "jeder".<sup>4)</sup> *nivišcv*<sup>5)</sup> is, according to Brandenstein, identic with *viššis*, only it is amplified by *ni-*; this interpretation is founded on the passage

23/2 sq.: *akit esλ sirmal pīs fēnsλibid nivišcv, fak*

*now (on) this temple<sup>6)</sup> who damages whatsoever, now*

In this passage we hardly could suppose any other signification of the word *nivišcv*. If so, it could not mean anything else but a part of the temple; and if this were the case, why should only one appurtenance of the temple be under divine protection? And which of them should be so eminently more important than the others, those which are not mentioned?

An interpretation of the passages quoted above brings the same result: In the clause which begins with the summarising particle *fak*, followed by *av*, obliquus of the enclitic demonstrative pronoun *-as*, the finite verb must be *varbtokid*<sup>6b)</sup>, because it has the same ending as *fēnsλibid* which is well known from the bilingual inscription 1, and stands at the end of the clause which is the position to be expected if it is a verb. If this is so, *viššis* cannot be anything else but the subject, because the only word that remains, *nivišcv*, is characterised by its ending as an obliquus.

From the context of the inscriptions it is quite clear that the formula *fakav — varbtokid* states the punishment that will be inflicted upon the culprit who performs the forbidden action stipulated in the previous clause. In all other formulae of this sort we know from the Lydian inscriptions, the punishment is inflicted by a deity. This will hardly be the case here, because it is quite improbable that *viššis* would be simply "(a) god"; against such a supposition speaks the fact that in all other examples the punishing deity in question is always specifically called by name, never referred to only generally. (The etymology of Littmann who tried to get the signification of "God" for *viššis* by the comparison of Etruscan *ais* which perhaps can mean "God" was disposed of by Brandenstein;

<sup>2a)</sup> || signifies the end of the inscription.

<sup>3)</sup> WZKM 36, 1929, 280 sq.

<sup>4)</sup> WZKM 38, 1932, 13.

<sup>5)</sup> Cf. *intištcv* 47/2, for the ending; Brandenstein, *Caucasica* 10, 1932, 82.

<sup>6)</sup> Brandenstein, WZKM 36, 1929, 271 sq.; *sirmaš* "temple" is concluded by combination; the inscription is written on a temple which is thus the most probable object to be referred to in the protective part of the formula of imprecation.

<sup>6b)</sup> For *fak*, *-av* and *varbtok* see p. 539 and 541.